



S-2418

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re the application of

Yoshihide HAGIWARA

Serial No. 08/950,902

Group: 1761

Filed: October 15, 1997

Examiner: C. SHERMER

For: PROCESS FOR PRODUCTION OF ALCOHOLIC COFFEE DRINKS

The Honorable Commissioner of  
Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

August 10, 1999

Sir:

This is in reply to the Communication from the Examiner,  
Paper No. 5, mailed August 4, 1999.

According to the Examiner's Communication the reply filed on  
June 4, 1999 was not fully responsive to the prior Office Action  
(mailed January 8, 1999) because: "there is no argument(s)  
directed to the 102(b) rejection based on Adams et al."

With all due respect, Applicants are not aware of any  
Section 102(b) rejection based on Adams et al in the Office  
Action mailed January 8, 1999, the only prior Office Action in  
this application.

A copy of the Action mailed to Applicant is enclosed.

Starting with the page 2, PART III DETAILED ACTION, there  
were 23 numbered paragraphs, none of which included a Section  
102(b) rejection based on Adams et al.

RECEIVED  
USPTO MAIL ROOM

JUL 11 1999

Specifically, the 23 numbered paragraphs are summarized below.

- ¶1. Acknowledges receipt of priority papers.
- ¶2. Quotation of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.
- ¶3. Claim 6 rejection, 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.
- ¶4. Quotation of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.
- ¶¶5-9. Section 112 rejections of claims 2, 4, 5-7 explained.
- ¶10. Quotation of 35 U.S.C. 102(b).
- ¶11. Claim 8 rejection, 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Papazian.
- ¶12. Explanation of Papazian rejection in ¶11.
- ¶13. Quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- ¶14. Claims 1-5, 7-8 rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Adams et al or Papazian.
  - ¶¶15-17. Explanation of Papazian and Adams et al as applied to ¶14 rejection.
  - ¶18. Claim 6 rejection, 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Adams et al or Papazian in view of Suzuki.
  - ¶19. Explanation of ¶18 rejection.
  - ¶20. "No claim is allowed."
  - ¶21. Regarding inquiries.
  - ¶22. Telephone and facsimile numbers.
  - ¶23. Status inquiry phone number.

Accordingly, Applicants disagree that the reply filed on June 4, 1999 was not responsive for failing to reply to a rejection under Section 102(b), namely, a rejection over Adams, et al.

Moreover, it is respectfully pointed out that full and complete responses to each of the rejections in paragraph 3, 11, 14, and 18, were included in the reply filed on June 4, 1999.

Therefore, allowance of the subject application or issuance of a new non-Final Office Action setting forth a new ground of rejection, if appropriate, is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by Richard A. Steinberg  
Richard A. Steinberg  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 26,588

SHERMAN & SHALLOWAY  
P.O. Box 788  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313  
(703) 549-2282